

AO 120 (Rev. 2/99)

TO: Mail Stop 8 Director of the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	REPORT ON THE FILING OR DETERMINATION OF AN ACTION REGARDING A PATENT OR TRADEMARK
---	---

In Compliance with 35 § 290 and/or 15 U.S.C. § 1116 you are hereby advised that a court action has been filed in the U.S. District Court Northern District California on the Patents or Trademarks:

DOCKET NO.	DATE FILED	U.S. DISTRICT COURT	
CV 11-05243 RS	May 3, 2012	450 Golden Gate Avenue, 16 th Floor, San Francisco CA 94102	
PLAINTIFF SANDISK CORPORATION		DEFENDANT ROUND ROCK RESEARCH LLC.	
PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.		DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

In the above—entitled case, the following patent(s) have been included:

DATE INCLUDED	INCLUDED BY		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment <input type="checkbox"/> Answer <input type="checkbox"/> Cross Bill <input type="checkbox"/> Other Pleading		
PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	
1		***See Attach Amended Complaint***	
2			
3			
4			
5			

In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued:

DECISION/JUDGEMENT

CLERK	(BY) DEPUTY CLERK	DATE
Richard W. Wieking	Gina Agustine-Rivas	May 7, 2012

Copy 1—Upon initiation of action, mail this copy to Commissioner Copy 3—Upon termination of action, mail this copy to Commissioner
 Copy 2—Upon filing document adding patent(s), mail this copy to Commissioner Copy 4—Case file copy

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '586 Patent)

60. SanDisk incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 31 of this Second Amended Complaint as though set forth in full herein.

5 61. The '586 patent issued on August 7, 2001 to named inventors Frankie Roohparvar,
6 Darrell Rinerson, Christophe Chevallier and Michael Briner and is entitled "Memory system having
7 programmable control parameters."

8 62. On or around August 3, 2011, Round Rock wrote a letter to SanDisk asserting
9 ownership of the Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the '586 patent. Round Rock asserted that
10 SanDisk flash memory products incorporate and use features and functionalities covered by the
11 Round Rock Asserted Patents and identified "all SanDisk Flash memory products" as infringing
12 "these patents, either directly or indirectly."

13 63. Round Rock has asserted that “All SanDisk Flash memory products” infringe the
14 Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the ’586 patent. On April 5, 2012, Round Rock alleged in a
15 counterclaim that SanDisk infringed the ’586 patent by selling “SanDisk microSD Memory Cards
16 and iNAND eMMC EFDs.”

17 64. SanDisk contends that it is not required to license the '586 patent from Round Rock
18 because, among other reasons, the claims of the '586 patent are exhausted with respect to SanDisk's
19 flash memory products. On information and belief, the accused flash memory products were made
20 and initially sold by a licensee under the '586 patent. Because the accused flash memory products
21 were sold by an authorized licensee, Round Rock's rights under the '586 patent are exhausted.

22 65. As a result of the acts described in this Second Amended Complaint, there exists a
23 substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory
24 judgment as to infringement of the '586 patent by SanDisk.

25 66. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between SanDisk and Round Rock as to
26 whether the claims of the '586 patent are infringed by SanDisk's flash memory products. A judicial
27 declaration is necessary and appropriate so that SanDisk may ascertain its rights regarding the '586
28 patent.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '791 Patent)

67. SanDisk incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 31 of this Second Amended Complaint as though set forth in full herein.

68. The '791 patent issued on May 27, 2005 to named inventors Frankie Roohparvar and Kevin Widmer and is entitled "Flash memory with DDRAM interface."

7 69. On or around August 3, 2011, Round Rock wrote a letter to SanDisk asserting
8 ownership of the Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the '791 patent. Round Rock asserted that
9 SanDisk flash memory products incorporate and use features and functionalities covered by the
10 Round Rock Asserted Patents and identified "all SanDisk Flash memory products" as infringing
11 "these patents, either directly or indirectly."

12 70. Round Rock has asserted that “All SanDisk Flash memory products” infringe the
13 Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the ’791 patent. On April 5, 2012, Round Rock alleged in a
14 counterclaim that SanDisk infringed the ’791 patent by selling “SanDisk iNAND eMMC EFDs”.

15 71. SanDisk contends that it is not required to license the '791 patent from Round Rock
16 because, among other reasons, the claims of the '791 patent are exhausted with respect to SanDisk's
17 flash memory products. On information and belief, the accused flash memory products were made
18 and initially sold by a licensee under the '791 patent. Because the accused flash memory products
19 were sold by an authorized licensee, Round Rock's rights under the '791 patent are exhausted.

20 72. As a result of the acts described in this Second Amended Complaint, there exists a
21 substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory
22 judgment as to infringement of the '791 patent by SanDisk.

23 73. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between SanDisk and Round Rock as to
24 whether the claims of the '791 patent are infringed by SanDisk's flash memory products. A judicial
25 declaration is necessary and appropriate so that SanDisk may ascertain its rights regarding the '791
26 patent.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '334 Patent)

74. SanDisk incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 31 of this Second Amended Complaint as though set forth in full herein.

75. The '334 patent issued on January 27, 2009 to named inventor Chang Ha and is entitled "Interleaved input signal path for multiplexed input."

7 76. On or around August 3, 2011, Round Rock wrote a letter to SanDisk asserting
8 ownership of the Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the '334 patent. Round Rock asserted that
9 SanDisk flash memory products incorporate and use features and functionalities covered by the
10 Round Rock Asserted Patents and identified "all SanDisk Flash memory products" as infringing
11 "these patents, either directly or indirectly."

12 77. Round Rock has asserted that “All SanDisk Flash memory products” infringe the
13 Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the ’334 patent. On April 5, 2012, Round Rock alleged in a
14 counterclaim that SanDisk infringed the ’334 patent by selling “solid state drives, products
15 compliant with the ONFi standard, and/or products utilizing error correction code Zero NAND (‘EZ-
16 NAND’) protocol”.

17 78. SanDisk contends that it is not required to license the '334 patent from Round Rock
18 because, among other reasons, the claims of the '334 patent are exhausted with respect to SanDisk's
19 flash memory products. On information and belief, the accused flash memory products were made
20 and initially sold by a licensee under the '334 patent. Because the accused flash memory products
21 were sold by an authorized licensee, Round Rock's rights under the '334 patent are exhausted.

22 79. As a result of the acts described in this Second Amended Complaint, there exists a
23 substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory
24 judgment as to infringement of the '334 patent by SanDisk.

25 80. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between SanDisk and Round Rock as to
26 whether the claims of the '334 patent are infringed by SanDisk's flash memory products. A judicial
27 declaration is necessary and appropriate so that SanDisk may ascertain its rights regarding the '334
28 patent.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '209 Patent)

81. SanDisk incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 31 of this Second Amended Complaint as though set forth in full herein.

82. The '209 patent issued on July 3, 2001 to named inventors Trung Doan, Gurtej Sandhu, Kirk Prall and Sujit Sharan and is entitled "Methods of forming a contact having titanium formed by chemical vapor deposition."

8 83. On or around August 3, 2011, Round Rock wrote a letter to SanDisk asserting
9 ownership of the Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the '209 patent. Round Rock asserted that
10 SanDisk flash memory products incorporate and use features and functionalities covered by the
11 Round Rock Asserted Patents and identified "all SanDisk Flash memory products" as infringing
12 "these patents, either directly or indirectly."

13 84. Round Rock has asserted that “All SanDisk Flash memory products” infringe the
14 Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the ’209 patent. On April 5, 2012, Round Rock alleged in a
15 counterclaim that SanDisk infringed the ’209 patent by selling “SanDisk iNAND eMMC EFDs,
16 SSDs, and the SanDisk family of SD Memory Cards”.

17 85. SanDisk contends that it is not required to license the '209 patent from Round Rock
18 because, among other reasons, the claims of the '209 patent are exhausted with respect to SanDisk's
19 flash memory products. On information and belief, the accused flash memory products were made
20 and initially sold by a licensee under the '209 patent. Because the accused flash memory products
21 were sold by an authorized licensee, Round Rock's rights under the '209 patent are exhausted.

22 86. As a result of the acts described in this Second Amended Complaint, there exists a
23 substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory
24 judgment as to infringement of the '209 patent by SanDisk.

25 87. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between SanDisk and Round Rock as to
26 whether the claims of the '209 patent are infringed by SanDisk's flash memory products. A judicial
27 declaration is necessary and appropriate so that SanDisk may ascertain its rights regarding the '209
28 patent.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '282 Patent)

3 88. SanDisk incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 31
4 of this Second Amended Complaint as though set forth in full herein.

5 89. The '282 patent issued on July 21, 1998 to named inventor Shane Leiphart and is
6 entitled "Resputtering to achieve better step coverage of contact holes."

7 90. On or around August 3, 2011, Round Rock wrote a letter to SanDisk asserting
8 ownership of the Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the '282 patent. Round Rock asserted that
9 SanDisk flash memory products incorporate and use features and functionalities covered by the
10 Round Rock Asserted Patents and identified "all SanDisk Flash memory products" as infringing
11 "these patents, either directly or indirectly."

12 91. Round Rock has asserted that “All SanDisk Flash memory products” infringe the
13 Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the ’282 patent. On April 5, 2012, Round Rock alleged in a
14 counterclaim that SanDisk infringed the ’282 patent by selling “SanDisk iNAND eMMC EFDs,
15 SSDs, and the SanDisk family of SD Memory Cards”.

16 92. SanDisk contends that it is not required to license the '282 patent from Round Rock
17 because, among other reasons, the claims of the '282 patent are exhausted with respect to SanDisk's
18 flash memory products. On information and belief, the accused flash memory products were made
19 and initially sold by a licensee under the '282 patent. Because the accused flash memory products
20 were sold by an authorized licensee, Round Rock's rights under the '282 patent are exhausted.

21 93. As a result of the acts described in this Second Amended Complaint, there exists a
22 substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory
23 judgment as to infringement of the '282 patent by SanDisk.

24 94. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between SanDisk and Round Rock as to
25 whether the claims of the '282 patent are infringed by SanDisk's flash memory products. A judicial
26 declaration is necessary and appropriate so that SanDisk may ascertain its rights regarding the '282
27 patent.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '344 Patent)

95. SanDisk incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 31 of this Second Amended Complaint as though set forth in full herein.

96. The '344 patent issued on February 15, 1994 to named inventors Guy Blalock, David Becker and Fred Roe and is entitled "Process for selectively etching a layer of silicon dioxide on an underlying stop layer of silicon nitride."

97. Micron previously sued SanDisk for infringement of the '344 patent. That lawsuit was settled and dismissed between the companies on mutually agreeable terms in 2002. As Micron's lawful assignee of the '344 patent, Round Rock is bound by the settlement agreement between Micron and SanDisk with regard to the '344 patent.

98. On or around August 3, 2011, Round Rock wrote a letter to SanDisk asserting ownership of the Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the '344 patent. Round Rock asserted that SanDisk flash memory products incorporate and use features and functionalities covered by the Round Rock Asserted Patents and identified "all SanDisk Flash memory products" as infringing "these patents, either directly or indirectly."

99. Round Rock has asserted that “All SanDisk Flash memory products” infringe the Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the ’344 patent. On April 5, 2012, Round Rock alleged in a counterclaim that SanDisk infringed the ’344 patent by selling “SanDisk iNAND eMMC EFDs, SSDs, and the SanDisk family of SD Memory Cards”.

100. SanDisk contends that it is not required to license the '344 patent from Round Rock because, among other reasons, the claims of the '344 patent are exhausted with respect to SanDisk's flash memory products. On information and belief, the accused flash memory products were made and initially sold by a licensee under the '344 patent. Because the accused flash memory products were sold by an authorized licensee, Round Rock's rights under the '344 patent are exhausted.

101. As a result of the acts described in this Second Amended Complaint, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment as to infringement of the '344 patent by SanDisk.

1 102. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between SanDisk and Round Rock as to
2 whether the claims of the '344 patent are infringed by SanDisk's flash memory products. A judicial
3 declaration is necessary and appropriate so that SanDisk may ascertain its rights regarding the '344
4 patent.

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '760 Patent)

7 103. SanDisk incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 31
8 of this Second Amended Complaint as though set forth in full herein.

9 104. The '760 patent issued on January 18, 2000 to named inventors Guy Blalock, David
10 Becker and Fred Roe and is entitled "Method for enhancing oxide to nitride selectivity through the
11 use of independent heat control."

12 105. Micron previously sued SanDisk for infringement of the '760 patent. That lawsuit
13 was settled and dismissed between the companies on mutually agreeable terms in 2002. As
14 Micron's lawful assignee of the '760 patent, Round Rock is bound by the settlement agreement
15 between Micron and SanDisk with regard to the '760 patent.

16 106. On or around August 3, 2011, Round Rock wrote a letter to SanDisk asserting
17 ownership of the Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the '760 patent. Round Rock asserted that
18 SanDisk flash memory products incorporate and use features and functionalities covered by the
19 Round Rock Asserted Patents and identified "all SanDisk Flash memory products" as infringing
20 "these patents, either directly or indirectly."

21 107. Round Rock has asserted that “All SanDisk Flash memory products” infringe the
22 Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the ’760 patent. On April 5, 2012, Round Rock alleged in a
23 counterclaim that SanDisk infringed the ’760 patent by selling “SanDisk iNAND eMMC EFDs,
24 SSDs, and the SanDisk family of SD Memory Cards”.

25 108. SanDisk contends that it is not required to license the '760 patent from Round Rock
26 because, among other reasons, the claims of the '760 patent are exhausted with respect to SanDisk's
27 flash memory products. On information and belief, the accused flash memory products were made

1 and initially sold by a licensee under the '760 patent. Because the accused flash memory products
2 were sold by an authorized licensee, Round Rock's rights under the '760 patent are exhausted.

3 109. As a result of the acts described in this Second Amended Complaint, there exists a
4 substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory
5 judgment as to infringement of the '760 patent by SanDisk.

6 110. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between SanDisk and Round Rock as to
7 whether the claims of the '760 patent are infringed by SanDisk's flash memory products. A judicial
8 declaration is necessary and appropriate so that SanDisk may ascertain its rights regarding the '760
9 patent.

TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '053 Patent)

12 111. SanDisk incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 31
13 of this Second Amended Complaint as though set forth in full herein.

14 112. The '053 patent issued on January 18, 2005 to named inventor Christophe Chevallier
15 and is entitled "Power Throughput Adjustment in Flash Memory."

16 113. Round Rock has asserted that SanDisk's eMMC iNAND Flash Model No. SDIN4C2-
17 16G infringes claims of the '053 patent.

18 114. SanDisk contends that it is not required to license the '053 patent from Round Rock
19 because, among other reasons, the claims of the '053 patent are exhausted with respect to SanDisk's
20 flash memory products. On information and belief, the accused flash memory products were made
21 and initially sold by a licensee under the '053 patent. Because the accused flash memory products
22 were sold by an authorized licensee, Round Rock's rights under the '053 patent are exhausted.

23 115. As a result of the acts described in this Second Amended Complaint, there exists a
24 substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory
25 judgment as to infringement of the '053 patent by SanDisk.

26 116. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between SanDisk and Round Rock as to
27 whether the claims of the '053 patent are infringed by SanDisk's flash memory products. A judicial

1 declaration is necessary and appropriate so that SanDisk may ascertain its rights regarding the '053
2 patent.

3 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

4 WHEREFORE, SanDisk prays that this Court:

5 A. Issue a declaration that SanDisk's flash memory products have not infringed and do
6 not infringe, either directly or indirectly, any valid claim of the '345 patent, the '586 patent, the '791
7 patent, the '334 patent, the '209 patent, the '282 patent, the '344 patent, the '760 patent, or the '053
8 patent;

9 B. Issue a declaration that the '520 patent, the '528 patent, and the '839 patent are
10 invalid;

11 C. Issue an order enjoining Round Rock, its officers, agents, servants, employees,
12 attorneys, parent and subsidiary corporations, assigns and successors in interest, and those persons in
13 active concert or participation with them, from alleging that SanDisk and/or SanDisk's customers
14 infringe any of the Round Rock Asserted Patents by making, using, selling, offering to sell or
15 importing SanDisk flash memory products;

16 D. Issue an order declaring that SanDisk is the prevailing party and that this is an
17 exceptional case under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and award SanDisk its reasonable attorneys fees, expenses,
18 and costs in this action; and

19 E. Issue such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

20 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

21 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b) and Northern District of California Local
22 Rule 3-6(a), SanDisk respectfully requests a trial by jury of all matters to which it is entitled to a trial
23 by jury.

24 Dated: May 2, 2012

Respectfully Submitted,

25 VINSON & ELKINS LLP

26 By: /s/ Chuck P. Ebertin
Chuck P. Ebertin

27 Attorneys for Plaintiff
28 SANDISK CORPORATION

1 CHUCK P. EBERTIN (SBN 161374)
2 cebertin@velaw.com
3 VINSON & ELKINS LLP
4 525 University Avenue, Suite 410
5 Palo Alto, CA 94301-1918
6 Tel: (650) 687-8200
7 Fax: (650) 618-1970

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff
9 SANDISK CORPORATION

10

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

13

14 SANDISK CORPORATION,

15 Case No. 3:11-cv-05243-RS

16 Plaintiff,

17 vs.
18 ROUND ROCK RESEARCH LLC,
19 Defendants.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587

588

589

590

591

592

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

648

649

650

651

652

653

654

655

656

657

658

659

660

661

662

663

664

665

666

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675

676

677

678

679

680

681

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

693

694

695

696

697

698

699

700

701

702

703

704

705

706

707

708

709

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

720

721

722

723

724

725

726

727

728

729

730

731

732

733

734

735

736

737

738

739

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

777

778

779

780

781

782

783

784

785

786

787

788

789

790

791

792

793

794

795

796

797

798

799

800

801

802

803

804

805

806

807

808

809

810

811

812

813

814

815

816

817

818

819

820

821

822

823

824

825

826

827

828

829

830

831

832

833

834

835

836

837

838

839

840

841

842

843

844

845

846

847

848

849

850

851

852

853

854

855

856

857

858

859

860

861

862

863

864

865

866

867

868

869

870

871

872

873

874

875

876

877

878

879

880

881

882

883

884

885

886

887

888

889

890

891

892

893

894

895

896

897

898

899

900

901

902

903

904

905

906

907

908

909

910

911

912

913

914

915

916

917

918

919

920

921

922

923

924

925

926

927

928

929

930

931

932

933

934

935

936

937

938

939

940

941

942

943

944

945

946

947

948

949

950

951

952

953

954

955

956

957

958

959

960

961

962

963

964

965

966

967

968

969

970

971

972

973

974

975

976

977

978

979

980

981

982

983

984

985

986

987

988

989

990

991

992

993

994

995

996

997

998

999

1000

1001

1002

1003

1004

1005

1006

1007

1008

1009

1010

1011

1012

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017

1018

1019

1020

1021

1022

1023

1024

1025

1026

1027

1028

1029

1030

1031

1032

1033

1034

1035

1036

1037

1038

1039

1040

1041

1042

1043

1044

1045

1046

1047

1048

1049

1050

1051

1052

1053

1054

1055

1056

1057

1058

1059

1060

1061

1062

1063

1064

1065

1066

1067

1068

1069

1070

1071

1072

1073

1074

1075

1076

1077

1078

1079

1080

1081

1082

1083

1084

1085

1086

1087

1088

1089

1090

1091

1092

1093

1094

1095

1096

1097

1098

1099

1100

1101

1102

1103

1104

1105

1106

1107

1108

1109

1110

1111

1112

1113

1114

1115

1116

1117

1118

1119

1120

1121

1122

1123

1124

1125

1126

1127

1128

1129

1130

1131

1132

1133

1134

1135

1136

1137

1138

1139

1140

1141

1142

1143

1144

1145

1146

1147

1148

1149

1150

1151

1152

1153

1154

1155

1156

1157

1158

1159

1160

1161

1162

1163

1164

1165

1166

1167

1168

1169

1170

1171

1172

1173

1174

1175

1176

1177

1178

1179

1180

1181

1182

1183

1184

1185

1186

1187

1188

1189

1190

1191

1192

1193

1194

1195

1196

1197

1198

1199

1200

1201

1202

1203

1204

1205

1206

1207

1208

1209

1210

1211

1212

1213

1214

1215

1216

1217

1218

1219

1220

1221

1222

1223

1224

1225

1226

1227

1228

1229

1230

1231

1232

1233

1234

1235

1236

1237

1238

1239

1240

1241

1242

1243

1244

1245

1246

1247

1248

1249

1250

1251

1252

1253

1254

1255

1256

1257

1258

1259

1260

1261

1262

1263

1264

1265

1266

1267

1268

1269

1270

1271

1272

1273

1274

1275

1276

1277

1278

1279

1280

1281

1282

1283

1284

1285

1286

1287

1288

1289

1290

1291

1292

1293

1294

1295

1296

1297

1298

1299

1300

1301

1302

1303

1304

1305

1306

1307

1308

1309

1310

1311

1312

1313

1314

1315

1316

1317

1318

1319

1320

1321

1322

1323

1324

1325

1326

1327

1328

1329

1330

1331

1332

1333

1334

1335

1336

1337

1338

1339

1340

1341

1342

1343

1344

1345

1346

134

THE PARTIES

2 2. Plaintiff SanDisk is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware,
3 and has its headquarters and principal place of business in Milpitas, California. SanDisk is engaged
4 in the business of, among other things, designing and selling flash memory products. SanDisk is a
5 global leader in flash memory storage solutions, from research and development, product design and
6 manufacturing to branding and distribution for OEM and retail channels. Since 1988, SanDisk's
7 innovations in flash memory and storage system technologies have provided customers with new
8 and transformational digital experiences.

9 3. Defendant Round Rock Research, LLC (“Round Rock”) is a Delaware limited
10 liability company with its principal place of business at Mount Kisco, New York.

JURISDICTION

12 4. This action arises under the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 *et seq.*, and
13 under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code. This Court has
14 jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, *et seq.*, and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, and
15 2201-2202.

16 5. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 and 1400(b) because a
17 substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims at issue occurred in this District.

18 6. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Round Rock by virtue of the business
19 activities it conducts within the State of California and within this District, resulting in sufficient
20 minimum contacts with this forum.

INTRADISTRIC ASSIGNMENT

22 7. This case is an Intellectual Property Action under Civil Local Rule 3-2(c) and,
23 pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-5(b), has been assigned on a district-wide basis to the Honorable
24 Judge Richard Seeborg.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

26 8. Round Rock does not compete with SanDisk in the marketplace for flash memory
27 products.

1 9. Round Rock is not in the business of manufacturing or selling flash memory products
2 and does not make, sell or design any commercial products.

3 10. Round Rock is in the business of patent licensing and monetization.

4 11. Round Rock approached SanDisk seeking to license patents to SanDisk that Round
5 Rock acquired from Micron Technology, Inc. ("Micron").

6 12. Round Rock has a contractual arrangement with IPValue Management, Inc.
7 ("IPValue") to assist Round Rock with commercialization efforts with regard to the Round Rock
8 patents. Upon information and belief, IPValue files state income taxes in California. Upon
9 information and belief, the majority of IPValue's employees are located in its California office.
10 Upon information and belief, Zahid Rahimtoola is the chief financial officer of IPValue. Upon
11 information and belief, Gemas Capital Inc. ("Gemas Capital") was established in June 2009 by
12 Zahid Rahimtoola. Upon information and belief, Gemas Capital is located at 650 Castro Street,
13 Suite 120-376, in Mountain View, California. Upon information and belief, Gemas Capital retains a
14 security interest in Round Rock and in the Round Rock Asserted Patents through various contractual
15 arrangements.

16 13. Mr. Gerald A. deBlasi is a Vice President at Round Rock. As a Vice President of
17 Round Rock, Mr. deBlasi affirmatively represented to SanDisk by letter dated August 3, 2011, that
18 Round Rock "has appointed IPVALUE Management, Inc. as its agent to commercialize Round
19 Rock's patents and other intellectual property rights worldwide."

20 14. Mr. deBlasi, in addition to being a Vice President of Round Rock, is also a member
21 of the Board of Directors of IPValue.

22 15. IPValue maintains an office in Mountain View, California.

23 16. IPValue employs at least four licensing executives in its California office, including
24 George S. Park, Jonathan Takei, Andrew Wu and Rowena Young.

25 17. Andrew Wu and Jui Min Lim (Licensing Associate & Member of Technical Staff at
26 IPValue) work in IPValue's Mountain View, California office.

27 18. Prior to October 27, 2011, Mr. Wu and/or Mr. Lim were involved in preparing claim
28 charts in California comparing SanDisk flash memory products to Round Rock patent claims.

1 19. Prior to October 27, 2011, Mr. Wu and/or Mr. Lim reviewed technical information,
2 including product manuals and photographs of SanDisk flash memory products, for purposes of
3 determining whether particular Round Rock patents applied to SanDisk's flash memory products.

4 20. Upon information and belief, IPValue has a financial interest in Round Rock's
5 licensing activities, including attempts to license SanDisk to Round Rock's patents.

6 21. Mr. Paul Riley is a Vice President of Licensing at IPValue. Mr. Riley made plans to
7 and did in fact travel to California for purposes of meeting with SanDisk on October 27, 2011, to
8 discuss the Round Rock Asserted Patents.

9 22. Messrs. Riley, Wu and Lim acted as Round Rock's agents for purposes of
10 commercializing Round Rock's patents with respect to communications and interactions with
11 SanDisk.

12 23. Round Rock is the principal of IPValue for purposes of commercializing Round
13 Rock's patents with respect to communications and interactions with SanDisk.

14 24. Upon information and belief, Apple, Inc. is headquartered in California.

15 25. Upon information and belief, Round Rock and/or IPValue have negotiated a patent
16 license with Apple for a license to patents owned by Round Rock.

17 26. Upon information and belief, Oracle Corporation is headquartered in California.

18 27. Upon information and belief, Round Rock and/or IPValue have negotiated with
19 Oracle for purposes of licensing patents owned by Round Rock.

20 28. IPValue engages in continuous and systematic activities in California.

21 29. The Round Rock Asserted Patents have been assigned to Round Rock and those
22 assignments have been recorded in the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO").

23 30. The Round Rock Asserted Patents were assigned from Micron to Round Rock.

24 31. As the lawful assignee of the Round Rock Asserted Patents, Round Rock is bound by
25 Micron's prior agreements with third parties with regard to the enforcement of the Round Rock
26 Asserted Patents.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity the '520 Patent)

32. SanDisk incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 31 of this Second Amended Complaint as though set forth in full herein.

33. The '520 patent issued on April 4, 2006 to named inventor Neal Bowen and is entitled "Stacked chip connection using stand off stitch bonding."

7 34. On or around August 3, 2011, Round Rock wrote a letter to SanDisk asserting
8 ownership of the Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the '520 patent. Round Rock asserted that
9 SanDisk flash memory products incorporate and use features and functionalities covered by the
10 Round Rock Asserted Patents and identified "all SanDisk Flash memory products" as infringing
11 "these patents, either directly or indirectly."

12 35. Round Rock has asserted that “All SanDisk Flash memory products” infringe the
13 Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the ’520 patent. On April 5, 2012, Round Rock alleged in a
14 counterclaim that SanDisk infringed the ’520 patent by selling “iNAND eMMC EFDs, SSDs, USB
15 flash drives, and the SanDisk family of SD Memory Cards”.

16 36. SanDisk contends that it is not required to license the '520 patent because, among
17 other reasons, the claims of the '520 patent are invalid as anticipated and/or obvious under 35 U.S.C.
18 §§ 102 and/or 103. For example, claims of the '520 patent are anticipated and/or obvious in view of
19 at least the following references: United States Patent Nos. 5,328,079, 5,422,435, 6,136,838,
20 6,555,401, 6,561,411, and 6,580,092, and Japanese Patent Publication Nos. JP2000114452A and
21 JP10229100A.

22 37. As a result of the acts described in this Second Amended Complaint, there exists a
23 substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory
24 judgment as to the validity of the '520 patent.

25 38. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between SanDisk and Round Rock as to
26 whether the claims of the '520 patent are valid. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate
27 so that SanDisk may ascertain its rights regarding the '520 patent.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity the '839 Patent)

39. SanDisk incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 31 of this Second Amended Complaint as though set forth in full herein.

40. The '839 patent issued on May 7, 2002 to named inventor Larry Kinsman and is entitled "Vertically mountable semiconductor device and methods."

7 41. On or around August 3, 2011, Round Rock wrote a letter to SanDisk asserting
8 ownership of the Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the '839 patent. Round Rock asserted that
9 SanDisk flash memory products incorporate and use features and functionalities covered by the
10 Round Rock Asserted Patents and identified "all SanDisk Flash memory products" as infringing
11 "these patents, either directly or indirectly."

12 42. Round Rock has asserted that “All SanDisk Flash memory products” infringe the
13 Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the ’839 patent. On April 5, 2012, Round Rock alleged in a
14 counterclaim that SanDisk infringed the ’839 patent by selling “SanDisk microSD Memory Cards”.

15 43. SanDisk contends that it is not required to license the '839 patent because, among
16 other reasons, the claims of the '839 patent are invalid as anticipated and/or obvious under 35 U.S.C.
17 §§ 102 and/or 103. For example, claims of the '839 patent are anticipated and/or obvious in view of
18 at least the following references: United States Patent No. 5,668,409 and R.A. Henle, *Vertical Chip*
19 *Packaging*, IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, Vol. 20, No 11A, pp. 4339-4340 (April 1978).

20 44. As a result of the acts described in this Second Amended Complaint, there exists a
21 substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory
22 judgment as to the validity of the '839 patent.

23 45. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between SanDisk and Round Rock as to
24 whether the claims of the '839 patent are valid. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate
25 so that SanDisk may ascertain its rights regarding the '839 patent.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity the '528 Patent)

46. SanDisk incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 31 of this Second Amended Complaint as though set forth in full herein.

47. The '528 patent issued on May 31, 2005 to named inventors Leonard Mess, Jerry Brooks and David Corisis and is entitled "Stacked mass storage flash memory package."

7 48. On or around August 3, 2011, Round Rock wrote a letter to SanDisk asserting
8 ownership of the Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the '528 patent. Round Rock asserted that
9 SanDisk flash memory products incorporate and use features and functionalities covered by the
10 Round Rock Asserted Patents and identified "all SanDisk Flash memory products" as infringing
11 "these patents, either directly or indirectly."

12 49. Round Rock has asserted that “All SanDisk Flash memory products” infringe the
13 Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the ’528 patent. On April 5, 2012, Round Rock alleged in a
14 counterclaim that SanDisk infringed the ’528 patent by selling “SanDisk iNAND eMMC EFDs,
15 SSDs, USB flash drives, and the SanDisk family of SD Memory Cards with eight (8) GB or higher
16 capacity”.

17 50. SanDisk contends that it is not required to license the '528 patent because, among
18 other reasons, the claims of the '528 patent are invalid as anticipated and/or obvious under 35 U.S.C.
19 §§ 102 and/or 103. For example, claims of the '528 patent are anticipated and/or obvious in view of
20 at least the following references: United States Patent Nos. 5,998,864, 6,252,305 and 6,605,875.

51. As a result of the acts described in this Second Amended Complaint, there exists a
52 substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory
53 judgment as to the validity of the '528 patent.

24 52. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between SanDisk and Round Rock as to
25 whether the claims of the '528 patent are valid. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate
26 so that SanDisk may ascertain its rights regarding the '528 patent.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '345 Patent)

3 53. SanDisk incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 31
4 of this Second Amended Complaint as though set forth in full herein.

5 54. The '345 patent issued on October 28, 1997 to named inventors Frankie Roohparvar
6 and Michael Briner and is entitled "Non-volatile data storage unit method of controlling same."

7 55. On or around August 3, 2011, Round Rock wrote a letter to SanDisk asserting
8 ownership of the Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the '345 patent. Round Rock asserted that
9 SanDisk flash memory products incorporate and use features and functionalities covered by the
10 Round Rock Asserted Patents and identified "all SanDisk Flash memory products" as infringing
11 "these patents, either directly or indirectly."

12 56. Round Rock has asserted that “All SanDisk Flash memory products” infringe the
13 Round Rock Asserted Patents, including the ’345 patent. On April 5, 2012, Round Rock alleged in a
14 counterclaim that SanDisk infringed the ’345 patent by selling “SanDisk microSD memory cards
15 and iNAND eMMC EFDs”.

16 57. SanDisk contends that it is not required to license the '345 patent from Round Rock
17 because, among other reasons, the claims of the '345 patent are exhausted with respect to SanDisk's
18 flash memory products. On information and belief, the accused flash memory products were made
19 and initially sold by a licensee under the '345 patent. Because the accused flash memory products
20 were sold by an authorized licensee, Round Rock's rights under the '345 patent are exhausted.

21 58. As a result of the acts described in this Second Amended Complaint, there exists a
22 substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory
23 judgment as to infringement of the '345 patent by SanDisk.

24 59. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between SanDisk and Round Rock as to
25 whether the claims of the '345 patent are infringed by SanDisk's flash memory products. A judicial
26 declaration is necessary and appropriate so that SanDisk may ascertain its rights regarding the '345
27 patent.